IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE EIGHTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MS JUSTICE G.ROHINI

WRIT PETITION NO : 15668 of 2000

Between:

Sk. Mohd. Ali, S/o.Sk.Khader Vali,

26 years, Occn : Telecom Contractor,

R/o.Door No.11-457, 1st Lane, Panduranga Nagar,

Amaravathi Road, Guntur.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1. The General Manager, Department of Telecommunications,
   Guntur.
2. The Sub-Divisional Engineer, Department of Telecommunications,
   Tenali.
3. The Sub-Divisional Engineer, Department of Telecommunications,
   Bapatla, Guntur District.
4. The Accounts Officer, Department of Telecommunications,
   Guntur.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court be pleased to issue a writ or order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in demanding and collecting the amount of

Rs.76,600/- from the petitioner towards penalty without any enquiry or inspection alleging that he did not fulfil the terms and conditions of the contract agreement, highly arbitrary, illegal, improper, unjust and violative of principles of natural justice and the procedure as contemplated in Telecom Rules in respect of the tender conditions and consequently direct the respondents to repay the amount of Rs.76,600/- to the petitioner, which was illegally collected from him and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

Counsel for the Petitioner : MR. P.JAGADISH CHANDRA PRASAD (Not present)

Counsel for the Respondents : MR. A. RAJASHEKAR REDDY (SC FOR CG)

The Court made the following :

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE G.ROHINI

WRIT PETITION NO.15668 OF 2000

ORAL ORDER :

On the last three occasions, there was no representation for the petitioner and therefore the matter is listed under the caption 'For Dismissal'. Even today, none appeared for the petitioner. Obviously, the petitioner is not interested in prosecuting the matter.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed for non-prosecution. No costs.

_____

08th December, 2004.

Gbs

To

1.The General Manager, Department of Telecommunications,
Guntur.

2.The Sub-Divisional Engineer, Department of Telecommunications,
Tenali.

3.The Sub-Divisional Engineer, Department of Telecommunications,

Bapatla, Guntur District.

4.The Accounts Officer, Department of Telecommunications,

Guntur.

5.2CD copies